

- 10 -

Appl. No. 09/929,424

Atty. Docket No. 10011005-1

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 4, 2006. By way of this amendment, claim 23 and the Title have been amended. Claims 1-36 are currently pending in the application. Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Objection to the Title:

The Examiner has objected to the title as not being descriptive. Applicant has amended the Title to: METHODS, SYSTEMS, DEVICES AND COMPUTER-READABLE MEDIA FOR ACCESSING NETWORK ACCESSIBLE DEVICES. Because the invention as claimed includes methods, systems, devices, and computer-readable media that relate to accessing a network-accessible device or an Internet-connected printer (which is a network-accessible device), it is submitted that the Title as amended is indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Applicant respectfully requests that the Title as amended be approved.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Ishizuka (US 2002/0065873). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites a system for accessing network-accessible devices in which each device includes a wireless transmitter for wirelessly transmitting associated address data and a connection module for establishing a network link with one or more client devices based on the wirelessly transmitted address data.

1095223.1

- 11 -

Appl. No. 09/929,424

Atty. Docket No. 10011005-1

Fig. 1 of Ishizuka shows a system for printing from a wireless mobile device 106 over a computer network 102. The system includes a server 104 for communicating with the wireless mobile device 106 and an addressable printer 110. Applicant respectfully submits that Ishizuka does not disclose a network-accessible device having a wireless transmitter for wirelessly transmitting address data associated with the network-accessible device for receipt by client devices as required by claim 1.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner contends that the wireless mobile device 106 of Ishizuka corresponds to the claimed wireless transmitter and the printer 110 of Ishizuka corresponds to a client device. Applicant respectfully submits that this is in error. The wireless mobile device 106, although likely containing a wireless transmitter, is not a network-accessible device, and the printer 110 is not a client device. Moreover, even assuming for the sake of argument that the wireless mobile device 106 is a network-accessible device, there is simply no suggestion that the wireless mobile device 106 transmits its associated address data for receipt by a client device.

Furthermore, there is no suggestion that the printer 110 of Ishizuka, which is arguably a network-accessible device, includes a wireless transmitter for wirelessly transmitting the printer's address data. Paragraph 0042 of Ishizuka explains that the printer 110 includes a communication interface 409 that provides a two-way data communication coupling to a local area network (LAN) 413. While this communication interface 409 can be implemented as a wireless link, Ishizuka does not disclose transmitting the printer's address data over the interface 409. The printer 110 does not transmit its address data, either wirelessly or otherwise, to the wireless mobile device 106. Instead, as described in paragraph 0029, the server 104 stores print drivers and printer network addresses that are accessible to enable the wireless mobile device 106 to print using the printer 110. The wireless mobile device 106 obtains the printer

1095223.1

- 12 -

Appl. No. 09/929,424

Atty. Docket No. 10011005-1

address data from the server 104, or alternatively from a print server 413 as described in paragraph 0043.

Ishizuka fails to disclose a network-accessible device that wirelessly transmits its address data to a client device. For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is allowable over Ishizuka. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and are thus also believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 6 recites a system for accessing Internet-connected printers in which each printer includes a wireless transmitter for wirelessly transmitting associated address data and an Internet connection module for establishing an Internet link with one or more client devices using the associated address data.

In rejecting claim 6, the Examiner again contends that the wireless mobile device 106 of Ishizuka is a wireless transmitter. However, the wireless transmitter of claim 6 is an element of an Internet-connected printer. The wireless mobile device 106 is not an element of an Internet-connected printer and is clearly distinct and separate from the only printer disclosed by Ishizuka, the printer 110. As discussed above, the printer 110 does not wirelessly transmit its address data. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 6 is allowable over Ishizuka. Claim 7 depends from claim 6 and is thus also believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 8 recites a network-accessible device, and claim 13 recites an Internet-connected printer. Both include, among other elements, one or more processors and a wireless transmitter for wirelessly transmitting associated address data. Both claims further recite computer-readable media having instructions that cause the processors to transmit the address data using the wireless transmitter and establish an Internet connection based on the wirelessly transmitted address data.

1095223.1

- 13 -

Appl. No. 09/929,424

Atty. Docket No. 10011005-1

Ishizuka fails to anticipate either one of claims 8 and 13. As discussed above, Ishizuka does not disclose a network-accessible device or an Internet-connected printer that includes a wireless transmitter for wirelessly transmitting associated address data. Ishizuka also fails to disclose computer-readable media having instructions as recited in claims 8 and 13. As described in paragraphs 0040 and 0041, the printer 110 of Ishizuka includes a processor 405 and a memory unit 407 that stores instructions to be executed by the processor 405. However, there is no indication that the processor 405 causes the printer 110 to wirelessly transmit its address data or establish an Internet connection based on the transmitted address data.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 8 and 13 are allowable over Ishizuka. Claims 9-12 depend from claim 8 and are thus also believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 14 recites a client device that includes, among other elements, one or more processors and a wireless receiver for receiving wirelessly transmitted address data associated with one or more Internet-accessible devices. The client device of claim 14 further includes computer-readable media having instructions that cause the processors to process address data wirelessly received by the wireless receiver and establish an Internet link with one or more Internet-accessible devices using the address data.

Applicant respectfully submits that Ishizuka does not teach or suggest a client device as recited in claim 14. First, as mentioned above, it is believed that the printer 110 of Ishizuka is simply not a "client device." Second, while arguably a client device, the wireless mobile device 106 does not receive address data wirelessly transmitted from one or more Internet-accessible devices.

1095223.1

- 14 -

Appl. No. 09/929,424

Atty. Docket No. 10011005-1

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 14 is allowable over Ishizuka. Claims 15-20 depend from claim 14 and are thus also believed to be allowable.

Independent claims 21, 29 and 32 recite a method for accessing network-accessible devices, a method for accessing Internet-accessible devices, and a method of accessing an Internet-connected printer, respectively. Each method includes wirelessly beaconing or receiving address data associated with a particular device and using the wirelessly transmitted address data to establish an Internet link or connection. For the reasons discussed above, Ishizuka fails to disclose these two steps. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 21, 29 and 32 are allowable over Ishizuka. Claims 22-27, which depend from claim 21, claims 30 and 31, which depend from claim 29, and claims 33-35, which depend from claim 32, are also believed to be allowable.

Independent claims 28 and 36 both recite one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon. In claim 28, the instructions cause one or more processors in a network-accessible device to wirelessly beacon address data associated with the network-accessible device and establish an Internet link with one or more client devices based on the wirelessly beacons address data. In claim 36, the instructions cause one or more processors on a client device to wirelessly receive address data associated with one or more Internet-connected printers and process the address data to establish an Internet link with one or more Internet-connected printers.

Ishizuka fails to disclose wirelessly beaconing associated address data from a network-accessible device or wirelessly receiving such address data with a client device. Ishizuka also fails to disclose establishing an Internet link based on such wirelessly transmitted data. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 28 and 36 are allowable over Ishizuka.

1095223.1

- 15 -

Appl. No. 09/929,424

Atty. Docket No. 10011005-1

Conclusion:

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the objections and rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 1-36 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

3/3/06

Date

Patrick R. Scanlon

Patrick R. Scanlon
Reg. No. 34,500
207-791-3110

1095223.1